

Application No. 10/771,865
Amendment dated March 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 24, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Responsive to the Official Action mailed November 24, 2004, applicants have revised the claims of their application in an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance. Specifically, claims 2 and 3 have been canceled, and independent claims 1 and 6 amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In accordance with the Examiner's requirements, applicants submit herewith a revised Figure 1, identifying the disclosed apparatus as "prior art". This sheet has been labeled as a "replacement sheet". Entry is respectfully requested.

In the Action, the Examiner rejected the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, raising questions with regard to certain claim language. By this response, reference to "improved" has been deleted. Additionally, the various recited steps of the present process have been revised to clarify the contemplated cleaning process. In particular, the claims have been revised to specify that the recited "positioning step" includes positioning the first particulate loosening surface of the nonwoven wipe over affixed particulates, such as by disposition of the wipe above and for contact with the affixed particulates.

The claims further specify that the cleaning process includes "actuating" the first particulate loosening surface, which, as described at page 4 of the specification, may include a back-and-forth motion, side-to-side motion, circular motion, or the like.

Application No. 10/771,865
Amendment dated March 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 24, 2004

The claims have been further revised to provide the proper antecedent basis for the various recited elements, as noted by the Examiner.

Additionally, claim 2 has been canceled, and the feature of this claim incorporated into claims 1 and 6. By this feature, the dimension and/or number of the recited three-dimensional projections of the particulate capturing surface of the present wipe increase in a direction away from a leading edge of that surface. This arrangement has been found to desirably enhance the effectiveness of the wipe, as particles being captured are retained by the increasingly numerous/sized projections, as the wipe is moved to capture the particles.

In the Action, the Examiner rejected the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103, with reliance upon commonly-assigned U.S. Patent Publication to Qashou et al., and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200991, to Keck et al.

By this response, applicants have revised the pending claims to set forth a cleaning process which is distinct from the commonly-owned Qashou et al. reference, by the recitation in the claims of providing the second, particle capturing surface with one of two select three-dimensional images.

In an effort to advance prosecution, applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer referencing the Qashou et al. document. Applicants also submit herewith copies of the Assignment records for the Qashou et al. application, and the present application, for the Examiner's confirmation of the common ownership of the two cases.

With respect to the cited Keck et al. document, it is respectfully noted that this patent contemplates formation of a "coform" nonwoven web, wherein a substantially *homogeneous mixture* of fibrous components is employed for forming the tufted product disclosed therein. This is evident from the description of formation of the contemplated web, at paragraphs [008] *et seq.*, where it is stated that the disclosed process includes:

- a) providing at least one stream containing meltblown filaments;
- b) providing at least one stream containing at least one secondary material; and
- c) converging the at least one stream containing at least one secondary material with the at least one stream of meltblown filaments to form a composite stream.

Thus, this reference clearly fails to teach or suggest applicants' claimed process, wherein a nonwoven wipe is provided with a first particulate loosening surface comprised of meltblown filaments, and a second particulate capturing surface comprising carded staple length fibers.

Moreover, Keck et al. fails to teach or suggest the provision of three-dimensional surface projections in the second surface with an image selected from one of: (1) an image wherein the projections increase in number and/or dimension in a direction away from a leading edge of the second surface; and (2) an image wherein first and second projections are provided, wherein the second projections are different from the first projections to present aesthetic and tactile qualities representative of both the first and second projections.

Application No. 10/771,865
Amendment dated March 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 24, 2004

Additionally, the Examiner has acknowledged that Keck et al. "fails to teach washing the wipe in a home laundering process", as specified in claim 6. It is believed that applicants' invention is further differentiated by this reference in view of this deficiency in its teachings, since a conform substrate such as contemplated by the Keck et al. reference is generally not considered to be washable. Thus, those skilled in the art *would not* consider the recited washing step of claim 6 to be evident from the teachings of Keck et al.

In view of the foregoing, formal allowance of claims 1, and 4-6 is believed to be in order and is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner wish to speak with applicants' attorneys, they may be reached at the number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required in connection with this submission to Deposit Account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Stephen D. Geimer, Reg. No. 28,846

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER
500 West Madison Street, Suite 3800
Chicago, Illinois 60661-2511
312/876-1800

Application No. 10/771,865
Amendment dated March 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 24, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage at First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on **March 28, 2005**.

